REMARKS

The office action of January 23, 2008, has been reviewed and its contents carefully noted. Reconsideration of this case, as amended, is requested. Claims 1-4, 12-38 and 47 remain in this case.

Preliminary Comments

a. Claim 1 was amended to address the problem raised in the objection.

b. Claims 1 and 15 were further amended to better define the invention and distinguish from the prior art, and dependent claims 2-4 and 34, 37 and 38 were amended accordingly.

Specifically:

1. the types of metadata in claim elements 1(a)(iv) (and corresponding element 15(a)(iv)(a)(4)) have been moved from the first part of element 1(a) (15(a)(iv)(a)) to the individual element to which they apply

2. a new element 1(a)(v) (and 15(a)(iv)(a)(5)) has been added to more clearly, positively and explicitly claim the novel "metadata on the metadata" of Applicants' invention.

3. dependent claims 2-4 (and their equivalents 34 and 37-38) were amended to change their dependency to further refine the metadata on metadata of the newly-added element 1(a)(v) or 15(a)(iv)(a)(5)

This now positively claims the "metadata on metadata", which was previously claimed as a relationship in the first "wherein clause" ("wherein the metadata in the metadata database define the instances in the metadata database…"). The "wherein" in that clause was changed to –such that--, since the relationship is now positively claimed. This is consistent with the application as filed (Table 1, for example) and all of Applicants' arguments in the office action responses and interviews to date. No new matter is added by this amendment.

c. The tables attached to the previously filed Section 131 affidavit have been re-annotated in accordance with these amended claims and are attached hereto as "Appendix A".

d. The numbered paragraphs below correspond to the numbered paragraphs in the Office Action.

Claim Objection

18. Claim 1 was objected to because it recited "encoded computer-readable medium", the Examiner stating that the Specification fails to provide support for this term.

The claim has been amended to change "encoded computer-readable medium" to "computer-readable data repository". While exactly this phrase is not used in exactly that form, the person having ordinary skill in the art would find support for this throughout the specification and drawings as filed. For example, the repository (26) is shown in figure 26 by the flowchart symbol for computer disk storage. The entire application recites how computer software and encoding methods (i.e. XML) are used with the World Wide Web (i.e. computer network) to access (i.e. read) the data stored in the repository, which must therefore by definition be computer-readable.

The field of the invention states,

> The present invention relates generally to databases and *the electronic storage* and retrieval of information related to materials and their properties.

The summary of the invention states,

> The system of the invention provides a method, *preferably implemented in computer software*, for the delivery, *storage*, maintenance and controlled access to data on materials, *stored* in a centrally administered *data repository*.

Applicant believes that this amendment overcomes the objection to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Section 131 Declaration

3. Applicants submitted a Declaration of the Inventors under Section 131 with the last Office Action Response, filed on October 30, 2007. The Examiner declared that this affidavit was considered ineffective to overcome the Rappold reference.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

In order to overcome the Rappold reference, the Section 131 declaration needs to establish that the Applicants had invented the subject invention prior to the effective date of the Rappold reference. That is, that the Applicants had both conceived and reduced the claimed invention to practice prior to that date.

The Examiner has stated that the Section 131 declaration is sufficient to support the date of conception. This leaves only the date of reduction to practice. Applicants believe that they have sufficiently supported a date of reduction to practice in the declaration which is before the effective date of the Rappold reference.

Claim 1, claims a data repository storing specific data in a specific way. Exhibit D to the declaration provided a printout of a data repository meeting every limitation of the claim, and the declaration stated that the data repository was implemented as a Microsoft Access database at least as early as September 19, 2002. These are *facts* which support the *fact* that the invention was reduced to practice – that is, that the tables provided in the exhibit are a repository, and that a working model existed. Therefore, the invention was reduced to practice – it is not necessary that a commercial product be on the market or that every bug be worked out to reduce the invention to practice. This is especially true in this case where the claimed invention is a depository storing data in a certain way and the declaration provided facts that there was indisputably a depository in existence which stored the claimed data in the claimed way.

Similarly, the facts provided in the declaration – *both* the supporting exhibits *and the statements of the Applicants made under penalty of perjury in the declaration* show implementation of the method claimed in claim 15.

Applicants' statement in the declaration that the repository existed and that a working system was produced and entered into testing, being statements made under oath with supporting exhibits, are *facts*, and should be accepted as such.

Applicants believe that the Section 131 declaration has sufficiently proven a date of invention early enough to remove the Rappold reference from consideration as prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

However, even if the Examiner still believes the Section 131 declaration to be insufficient, the Applicants believe the Rappold reference (and all the other cited references) do not show the Applicants invention as claimed in the claims as amended, and the invention is patentable over the art for the reasons explained below.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §103

23. The prior art rejections of all of the remaining claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) were maintained from the previous office actions. Specifically, claims 1-4 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rappold, III (US PGPub 2004/0117397) in view of Arritt et al. (US PGPub 2005/0131861) and further in view of the dissertation titled "Pulsed DC Reactive Magnetron Sputtering of Aluminum Nitride Thin Films" by Jung Won Cho.

24. Claims 15-19, 21-26, 28-30, 34-38, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the above references in further view of Boyd et al.(US PGP 2003/0069795).

25. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the all of the above in further view of Markki et al. (US PGPub 2004/0243580).

26. Lastly, claims 27, and 31-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references cited above in the rejection of claim 15 in further view of O'Hare et al. (US 6,484,173).

Applicant believes that the previously-submitted Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 and Exhibits A-F provided sufficient evidence to show that the date of invention was prior to the filing date of Rappold (December 16, 2002), and also Markki (May 27, 2003), for the reasons stated above. For these reasons, as stated above, Applicants believe that Rappold, the base reference for all of the obviousness rejections, should not be available as a reference due to Applicants' prior invention and the rejection of the application over Rappold and Markki should be overcome.

With those references removed from consideration, Applicant believes that the present invention is not rendered obvious over the remaining references (Arritt and Cho, as well as Boyd), for the reasons expressed in the prior Office Action responses and the interviews with the Examiner on October 26, 2006, November 6, 2006 and October 22, 2007.

However, Applicants' also believe that even if Rappold were available as a reference, the invention claimed in independent claims 1 and 15, as amended, is patentable over the references cited.

Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to more clearly define the novel "metadata on metadata" feature of the invention, which Applicant believes is not shown or taught by any of the prior art, alone or in combination. Specifically, claim 1(a) (and corresponding claim 15(a)(iv)(a)) now recites:

a) a metadata database in the form of instances with associated metadata giving information about the instances, the metadata comprising at least one data element selected from a list comprising name, description, and identifying information, the metadata database comprising:

i) metadata on the material;

ii) metadata on the sample;

iii) metadata on the test;

iv) metadata on data value elements in a test result database further comprising at least one data element selected from a list comprising data type, units, acceptable values or ranges, and default value; and

v) metadata on the metadata, comprising at least one data element describing the metadata on the material, sample, test and data value elements in the metadata database;

Neither Rappold's application nor the other cited references discloses or teaches the novel "metadata on metadata" feature of the invention claimed in independent claims 1 and 15 of the present application, as amended.

The data table (50) in Rappold's system corresponds to the test result database in Applicants' invention (claim 1(b), or claim 15(a)(iv)(b)), in that each of the instances in the data table is information about a user (analogous to one of a material, sample or test) comprising a data element identifying the user (material, sample or test) and a data value element, which in all cases in Rappold is a single data point.

The Examiner identified elements corresponding to claim 1(a)(i) through (iv) – "First" corresponding to metadata on the material (1(a)(i)), "Username" corresponding to metadata on the sample (1(a)(ii)) and "Extension" corresponding to metadata on the test (1(a)(iii)), and "string" as "metadata on data value elements in a test result database" as claimed in claim 1(a)(iv).

Since Rappold's database isn't a repository of materials property data, the assignment of parts of a list of users and their phone numbers in Rappold to the claimed metadata on materials, samples and tests in a materials property database in the Applicants' invention is arbitrary at best. However, one can allow for arguments' sake that Rappold shows metadata on different kinds of data elements within the contexts of his system and has at least one value of predefined metadata on data value elements ("string").

What is missing from Rappold (and Arritt, Cho, Boyd, Markki, O'Hare and all other references cited or known to Applicants) is the "metadata on metadata" feature, claimed in the newly added parts of claim 1 and 15 - that is, Claim1(a)(v) and Claim 15(a)(iv)(a)(5) - "*metadata*

on the metadata, comprising at least one data element describing the metadata on the material, sample, test and data value elements in the metadata database" … "*such that the metadata in the metadata database define the instances in the metadata database".*

The Examiner identified paragraph [0029] in Rappold as showing the "wherein the metadata in the metadata database define the instances in the metadata database…" Applicants respectfully disagree with this statement, and suggest that only hindsight based on Applicants' invention would lead anyone to read this into the description in Rappold. Paragraph [0029] of Rappold says:

> [0029] The other component of the extensible database system shown in FIG. 1 is metadata table 11. Metadata table 11 is comprised of metadata table rows 101a-101d and columns 111, 113, and 115. *Each row 101 of Metadata table 11 provides parameters and formatting information for one attribute type stored in data table 10.* Column 111 holds numbers representing the attribute type whose parameters and formatting information is provided on that particular row 101 of metadata table 11. These correspond to the entries in column 114 of data table 10, as illustrated by the connections between entry 111a in metadata table 11 and entries 114a and 114e in data table 10. Both data table rows 100a and 100e hold first names, which are of attribute type "1". As shown by entry 111a, metadata table row 101a provides formatting information for this attribute type, attribute type "1", or first names. *Likewise, the other metadata table rows, rows 101b-101d, also provide parameters and formatting information for other data table rows 100.* [emphasis added]

As can be clearly seen from this paragraph and from the data in Figure 4, Rappold teaches a metadata table 11 providing "*parameters and formatting information for one attribute type stored in data table 10".* There is no mention in this paragraph, or anywhere else in Rappold, that the metadata in the metadata table could provide any information *about the other metadata in the metadata table.*

This distinction between metadata on the elements in the data table (as done by Rappold) and "metadata on metadata" of Applicants' invention is clearly shown in the database tables provided as exhibit "D" to the Section 131 declaration filed on October 30, 2007:

Pages D7-D9 and D11 show the test result database (pages D7-D9 corresponding to claim 1(b)(i) and page D11 corresponding to claim 1(b)(ii)).

Pages D1-D6 and D10 show the metadata table, with pages D4-6 and D10 showing the metadata on the data table analogous to Rappold's system:

- Page D4 shows a table of "metadata on the material" (claim 1(a)(i)) – for example, see line 2 of the table, giving metadata on sample EXP23569, corresponding to the instance of line 2 of the test result database sample table on page D10

- Page D10 shows a table of "metadata on the sample" (claim 1(a)(ii)) – for example, see line 2, giving metadata on sample ID 5233, which corresponds to line 1 of the test result database property measurement table on page D7-D8.

- Page D5 shows a table of "metadata on the test" (claim 1(a)(iii)) – for example, see the line starting "Speed" (ID 8), which corresponds to the "parameter ID" entry on lines 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9 of the test result database property measurement table on page D9.

- Page D6 shows a table of "metadata on the data value element" (claim 1(a)(iv)) – for example, see the line for ID 201 "Compressive Modulus", which corresponds to the "property result ID" on lines 3, 6 and 9 of the test result database property measurement result table on page D11.

As can be seen, each of the metadata database tables detailed above give *metadata about the data in the test results database*. In contrast, pages D1 to D3 show tables of "metadata on metadata in the metadata database" according to the present invention (claims 1(a)(v) and 15(a)(iv)(a)(5)):

- Page D1 shows a table giving metadata on metadata about suppliers – specifically, see the second line of the table, which says that supplier "Dow Chemicals" is ID number 2, and has a website URL of www.dow.com. This gives metadata on the metadata "Dow Chemicals" which appears in the metadata database table of "metadata on material" shown on page D4, lines 2-4. Similarly, line 1 of the table on D1 gives metadata on the metadata "Owens Corning" on line 1 of the table on D4.

- Page D2 shows a table giving metadata on metadata about materials subclasses. Looking at the fourth line of the table, one can see metadata on subclass "PP" (it is in class "plastic", and has ASTM name "PP"). This is metadata on the metadata "PP" which appears in the metadata database table on page D4, lines 2-4.

- Page D3 shows a table giving metadata on metadata about material properties. This is metadata on the metadata appearing on the "metadata on tests" table on page D5. For example, the metadata "Coefficient of Friction", appearing on lines 2-3 of the table on page D5, has metadata on metadata on line 3 of the table on page D3. Metadata on the other metadata in column 4 of the table on page D5 can similarly be found in the table on page D3.

Neither Rappold, nor Arritt, nor Cho, nor Makki, nor O'Hare teach, show or suggest the Applicants' metadata on metadata feature as used in a data repository for material property data. Therefore, the combination of the references cannot supply which every one of them lacks.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 1-4, 11-38, 41-42, and 47 are therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the claims, as amended, are patentable over the prior art, and that this case is now in condition for allowance of all claims therein. Such action is thus respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees, or believes for any other reason that direct contact with Applicants' attorney would advance the prosecution of the case to finality, she is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully Submitted:
Hubert Lobo and Kurien Jacob

By:_____/mfb #29619/_____

Michael F. Brown, Reg. No. 29,619
Attorney for Applicant
BROWN & MICHAELS, P.C.,
400 M&T Bank Building, 118 N. Tioga St.
Ithaca, NY 14850
(607) 256-2000 • (607) 256-3628 (fax) • e-mail: docket@bpmlegal.com
Dated: July 8, 2008

Appendix A

"Exhibit D" from Section 131 Declaration
Annotated to Correspond to Claims as Amended in this Response

Appendix is on Pages D1-D11 following this cover sheet

Exhibit D - page D1

Material Supplier

SupplierID	SupplierName	Material Supplierurl
1	Owens Corning	
2	Dow Chemicals	www.dow.com
3	BASF	
4	ALCOA	

Claim 1(a)(v) - Metadata on Metadata on Suppliers

Exhibit D - page D2

ISO Name	ASTM Name	Class	Group
PE-HD	HDPE	Plastic	
PE-LD	LDPE	Plastic	
PC	PC	Plastic	
PP	PP	Plastic	

Claim 1(a)(v) - Metadata on Metadata on Materials Subclasses

Name	Category	Description
Capillary Viscosity	Flow	Viscous behavi
Charpy Impact	Mechanical	None
Coefficient of Friction	Mechanical	None
Coefficient of Linear Thermal Expansion	Thermal	None
Compressive Creep	Mechanical	None
Compressive Properties	Mechanical	None
Dynamic Mechanical Properties in Torsion	Mechanical	None
Flexural Creep	Mechanical	None
Flexural Fatigue	Mechanical	None
Flexural Properties	Mechanical	None
Heat Deflection Temperature	Thermal	None
Instrumented Dart Impact	Mechanical	None
Izod Impact	Mechanical	None
Melt Rheology by Dynamic Mechanical Analysis	Flow	None
Planar Tension	Mechanical	None
Shear Strength	Mechanical	None
Specific Heat	Thermal	None
Stress Relaxation	Mechanical	None
Tensile Creep	Mechanical	None
Tensile Properties	Mechanical	None
Thermal Analysis	Thermal	None
Thermal Conductivity	Thermal	None
Thermal Diffusivity	Thermal	None
Vicat Softening Temperature	Thermal	None

Name	Class	Subclasses	Specifications	Manufacturer	Terms	Notes	Formula	Applications
E-Glass	Glass			Owens Corning		E type Glass us		
EXP 23569	Plastic	PP		Dow Chemicals			Polypropylene	
ProFax 6323	Plastic	PP		Dow Chemicals			Polypropylene	
Test1	Thermoplastic	PP		Dow Chemicals				

Exhibit D - page D4

Claim 1(a)(i) - Metadata on Material

Exhibit D - page D5

Name	ID	Techniqu	Property Name	Category	Type	Units	Numeric	Numeric	Numeric	Numeric
Temperature	1	R-011A	Capillary Viscosity	Test Parameter	Numeric	C		23	400	5
Substrate	2	M-060A	Coefficient of Friction	Test Parameter	String					
Speed	3	M-060A	Coefficient of Friction	Test Parameter	Numeric	mm/mi	50	5	500	2
Substrate	4	M-060I	Tensile Creep	Test Parameter	String			0	0	0
Speed	5	M-060I	Coefficient of Friction	Test Parameter	Numeric	mm/mi	100	5	500	0
Conditioning	6	M-060A	Coefficient of Friction	Specimen Detai	String			0	0	0
Conditioning	7	M-060I	Coefficient of Friction	Specimen Detai	String			0	0	0
Speed	8	M-210A	Compressive Properti	Test Parameter	Numeric	mm/mi	5	1	500	0
Surface	9	M-210A	Compressive Properti	Test Parameter	String			0	0	0
Precycling	10	M-210A	Compressive Properti	Test Parameter	String			0	0	0
Temperature	11	M-210A	Compressive Properti	Test Parameter	Numeric	C	23	-70	250	0
Specimen Type	12	M-210A	Compressive Properti	Specimen Detai	String					0
Specimen Orie	13	M-210A	Compressive Properti	Specimen Detai	String					0
Specimen Con	14	M-210A	Compressive Properti	Specimen Detai	String					0
***START	50		Capillary Viscosity	Test Parameter	String					
Specimen Test	101		Tensile Properties	Specimen Detai	String					
Specimen Con	102		Tensile Properties	Specimen Detai	String					
Other Specime	103		Tensile Properties	Specimen Detai	String					
Specimen Orie	104		Tensile Properties	Specimen Detai	String					
Test Temperat	105		Tensile Properties	Test Parameter	Numeric	°C	23			0.0
Laboratory Hu	106		Tensile Properties	Test Parameter	Numeric	%				0.0
Crosshead Spe	107		Tensile Properties	Test Parameter	Numeric	mm/mi	5			3
Extensometry	108		Tensile Properties	Test Parameter	String					
Specimen Test	201		Compressive Properti	Specimen Detai	String					
Specimen Con	202		Compressive Properti	Specimen Detai	String					
Other Specime	203		Compressive Properti	Specimen Detai	String					
Test Temperat	205		Compressive Properti	Test Parameter	Numeric	°C	23			0.0
Laboratory Hu	206		Compressive Properti	Test Parameter	Numeric	%				0.0
Crosshead Spe	207		Compressive Properti	Test Parameter	Numeric	mm/mi	1.3			
Extensometry	208		Compressive Properti	Test Parameter	String					
Specimen Test	301		Flexural Properties	Specimen Detai	String					
Specimen Con	302		Flexural Properties	Specimen Detai	String					
Other Specime	303		Flexural Properties	Specimen Detai	String					

Claim 1(a)(iii) - Metadata on Test

ID	Property Name	Name	Result Ty	Summary	Definition	Table	Plot
1	Compressive Properties	Compressive Modulus	Numeric	☐	Compressive modulus is the slope of the st	☑	
2	Compressive Properties	Compressive Strength	Numeric	☐	This is the maxima	☑	
3	Dynamic Mechanical Pr	G'G" Plot	XYYMatr	☐	Visco-elastic proerpties representing the lo	☑	Symb
4	Dynamic Mechanical Pr	Tan Delta Plot	XYMatri	☐		☐	Symb
5	Capillary Viscosity	Cross Model	XYZ Eqn	☑	4 coeff viscosity model	☐	Line
101	Tensile Properties	Tensile Modulus	X	☐	The slope of the stress-strain curve over a	☑	
102	Tensile Properties	Tensile Modulus - Young's	X	☐	The slope of the initial, linear portion of the	☑	
103	Tensile Properties	Tensile Modulus - Secant	X	☐	The ratio of the stress to the strain at a give	☐	
104	Tensile Properties	Offset Yield Stress in Tension	X	☐	The stress at the intercept of the stress-str	☑	
105	Tensile Properties	Offset Yield Strain in Tension	X	☐	The strain at the intercept of the stress-stra	☑	
106	Tensile Properties	Tensile Strength at Yield	X	☐	The stress at a local maxima on the stress-	☑	
107	Tensile Properties	Tensile Strain at Yield	X	☐	The strain at which the stress reaches a loc	☑	
108	Tensile Properties	Tensile Strength at Break	X	☐	The stress at which the specimen broke.	☑	
109	Tensile Properties	Tensile Strain at Break	X	☐	The strain at which the specimen broke.	☑	
110	Tensile Properties	Poisson's Ratio	X	☐	The ratio of the transverse (contraction) str	☑	
111	Tensile Properties	Engineering Tensile Stress-St	XY	☐	Stress (load / initial cross-sectional area) vs	☐	Line
112	Tensile Properties	True Tensile Stress-Strain Cur	XY	☐	True stress (engineering stress adjusted fo	☐	Line
113	Tensile Properties	Engineering Tensile Stress-St	XY	☐	Reduced set of points from the engineering	☑	
114	Tensile Properties	True Tensile Stress-Strain Dat	XY	☐	Reduced set of points from the true stress-	☑	
201	Compressive Properties	Compressive Modulus	X	☐	The slope of the stress-strain curve over a	☑	
202	Compressive Properties	Compressive Modulus - Youn	X	☐	The slope of the initial, linear portion of the	☑	
203	Compressive Properties	Compressive Modulus - Seca	X	☐	The ratio of the stress to the strain at a give	☑	
204	Compressive Properties	Offset Yield Stress in Compre	X	☐	The stress at the intercept of the stress-str	☑	
205	Compressive Properties	Offset Yield Strain in Compres	X	☐	The strain at the intercept of the stress-stra	☑	
206	Compressive Properties	Compressive Strength at Yield	X	☐	The stress at a local maxima on the stress-	☑	
207	Compressive Properties	Compressive Strain at Yield	X	☐	The strain at which the stress reaches a loc	☑	
211	Compressive Properties	Engineering Compressive Str	XY	☐	Stress (load / initial cross-sectional area) vs	☐	Line
212	Compressive Properties	True Compressive Stress-Stra	XY	☐	True stress (engineering stress adjusted fo	☐	Line
213	Compressive Properties	Engineering Compressive Str	XY	☐	Reduced set of points from the engineering	☑	
214	Compressive Properties	True Compressive Stress-Stra	XY	☐	Reduced set of points from the true stress-	☑	
301	Flexural Properties	Flexural Modulus	X	☐	The slope of the stress-strain curve over a	☑	
302	Flexural Properties	Flexural Modulus - Young's	X	☐	The slope of the initial, linear portion of the	☑	
303	Flexural Properties	Tensile Modulus - Secant	X	☐	The ratio of the stress to the strain at a give	☑	

Exhibit D - page D6

Claim 1(a)(iv) - Metadata on Data Value Element

ID	Sample ID	Property Name	Measurement Technique ID	ProviderRefID	Data Provider	Measurement Instru
1001	5233	Specific Heat	T-015A	3443	DatapointLabs	Perkin Elmer
1002	5233	Dynamic Mech	M-210A	3443	DatapointLabs	Rheometrics ARES
1003	5233	Capillary Visco	M-210A	3443	DatapointLabs	Goettfert Capillary R
2001	5774	Capillary Visco	R-011A	3443	DatapointLabs	Goettfert Rheograph

Claim 1(b)(i) - Test Result Database
data elements on material, sample and test
(half of table - see page D8 for additional columns)

Page D8 adjoins here

Measurement Date	MeasuredBy	CertifiedBy	Accredited	Notes
3/15/2002	CM	TB	✓	
2/3/2002	HL	TB	✓	
3/15/2002	JA	TB	✓	
8/15/2002	JA	TB	✓	

Exhibit D - page D8
Page D7 adjoins above

Continuation of table from page D7

ID	Parameter ID	Measurement ID	Value	Parameter Tuple ID
1000	8	1001	5	354
1001	11	1001	23	354
1002	8	1001	5	355
1003	11	1001	60	355
1004	8	1001	5	356
1005	11	1001	100	356
1006	8	1001	50	357
1007	11	1001	23	357
1008	8	1001	500	358
1009	11	1001	23	358
2001	2110	2001	220	101
2002	2110	2001	240	101
2003	2110	2001	260	101

Exhibit D - page D9

Claim 1(b)(i) - Test Results Database
Data Elements on materials, samples, tests

SampleID	MaterialNameA	AliasName	Sample Identifi	Sample Source	Form	Geometry
5224	EXP 23569	ProFax 6323	Lot# 2356	Dow Chemical	ASTMD790 flex	5" long, 12.5 mm wide, 3.16 mm thi
5233	EXP 23569	ProFax 6323	Lot# 2356	Dow Chemical	ASTM Typ1 Te	12.5 mm wide, 3.16 mm thick
5554	EXP 23569	ProFax 6323	Injection Molde	Black&Decker	pellets	na
5774	Test1				pellets	

Exhibit D - page D10

Claim 1(a)(ii) - Metadata on Sample

ID	Property Measurement ID	Property Result ID	Result Value	Result Type	Result Notes
1	1001	211	10,25.1, 100, 12.2	Value	Eng ss
2	1001	212	10,20.3, 100,11.5	Value	True ss
3	1001	201	123	Value	Modulus
4	1001	211	10,25.1, 100, 12.2	Value	Eng ss
5	1001	212	10,20.3, 100,11.5	Value	True ss
6	1001	201	125	Value	Modulus
7	1001	211	10,25.1, 100, 12.2	Representative	Eng ss
8	1001	212	10,20.3, 100,11.5	Representative	True ss
9	1001	201	128	Representative	Modulus
101	2001	2101	52.88126307,277.141640	Value	
102	2001	2101	53.01389209,207.336220	Value	
103	2001	2101	52.49668912,174.482432	Value	
104	2001	2111	0.32309,,2.258E+04,Pa,6	Value	

Exhibit D - Page D11

Claim 1(b)(ii) - Data Value Elements